



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

007
ENG
ART

THE ARTIST

OCTOBER Number

1899

The American Survey

Edited by Charles H. Caffin

IN another column appears a list of the National Juries who will make selection of works for art for the United States Exhibit at the Paris Exposition. It is quite inevitable that every reader will note the absence of some names, which he would like to have seen included. This is a matter of individual preference, and the fairer way is to estimate the personnel of the Juries as it is and not as it might have been; for the latter would make the discussion interminable. Do the members, individually, inspire confidence, by reason of their own work, their attitude towards their fellows and their previous services as jurymen? If some of them do not win your entire approval on all these points, are their individual deficiencies sufficiently counteracted by the qualifications of their colleagues? Does the aggregate in each jury give promise of a high standard of selection and complete impartiality in enforcing it? Are the various art centres of the country and the different tendencies of modern art and its various branches fairly represented?

For example, in the Jury for Oil Paintings, Water-Colors and Pastels, the largest and most important, are the interests of landscape painting, the branch of which Americans are most reasonably proud, well cared for? Are those of Portraiture, in which our men next excel? Of Figure painting, genre and still-life? Of the twenty-one jurymen ten devote themselves, entirely or in part, to landscapes and marines. Exhibits are limited to works produced since the opening of the last Paris Exposition, May 1, 1889; presumably, therefore, the French authorities desire examples of the tendencies developed in the past ten years, which shall represent, not only work actually done in this period, but the bias of the period, its aims and accomplishments as distinguished from those of other periods. During these years, for instance, Impressionism

has ceased to be a separate cult, while all the best landscapists are more or less impressionistic. The teaching of Monet and Sisley has passed from dogmatism into an active principle, no longer the one thing needful but one of the means of value. It was, therefore, unnecessary to place upon the jury an extreme impressionist, could such a painter have been found in America, which is doubtful. The men selected are sufficiently influenced by impressionism to represent its influence on modern tendencies.

More or less directly identified with Portraiture are at least seven of the jury; with Figure painting as many, and with genre, perhaps, three. But analysis of this kind reaches only approximate results, as in many of the men the different branches overlap. This is good, because the sympathies of the various sections of the jury, instead of being arrayed in opposite camps, will play into and through each other, giving elasticity and breadth to the judgment of the whole body. It is just this adjustment of check and countercheck which will keep the jury from swinging unduly in any one direction. From the storytelling picture at one end of the scale to the exultation in mere technical facility at the other, and with a great number of varying combinations of purpose and of execution in between, practically every tendency amongst American artists is fairly represented.

As individuals, the members of this jury are distinguished; either for the work they have done or for the official positions occupied, or for both reasons. While all of them are personally acceptable to many of their fellow artists, a large majority are probably acceptable to all. In fact, judged from every point of view, this National Jury is as little open to criticism and as full of excellent possibilities as could be desired. Of no jury could more be said with strict veracity.

DEFICIENCIES IN ART EDUCATION

SHALL the Dewey Arch be reproduced in permanent form? This is a question constantly being asked and the irresponsible enthusiasm which o'erleaps itself replies in the affirmative. But there are, at least, two reasons against it. In the first place, the arch, while dignified enough as a temporary structure, is not worthy of being perpetuated. None realise this more than the sculptors. The scheme was hastily planned and has been subjected to hand-to-mouth modification in the hurry of execution, while no portion of the statuary represents its author at his best or within many degrees of it. Everything has been inadequately planned and carried through chiefly with a view to being finished in time. Yet it is noble enough, notwithstanding, to suggest how good it would be for The City of New York to possess some such memorial permanently. By all means, but let the present scheme go. It has served its turn admirably. The new one must be begun *de novo*, and the sculptors must be paid for their services. They have done quite enough gratuitously.

As often the case when people make a sacrifice, the sculptors found themselves involved in greater ones than they had anticipated. They originally pledged themselves to present the sketch models; almost all of them by the development of circumstances have added their services in the process of enlargement, not only of their own pieces, but of the sculpture generally; "to help it along." They have been indefatigable in well doing, and have substituted for the usual commonplace features of a civic function a conspicuous artistic triumph. The Mural Painters, working within the limits of a small appropriation, have ably supplemented the work of the sculptors. Both sets of artists have established a precedent which cannot be allowed to lapse in the future.



WITH the reopening of the Art Schools this month it is timely to repeat how little they are doing for one important branch of art. The greatness of the country is largely due to and bound up in her industries, yet, in comparison with the interests at stake, next to nothing is being done for Industrial-Art education. There are special

schools nominally devoted to it, but in actual practice they very generally stultify themselves. They are keen to assert that a student can receive in them a "Fine Arts" training if he wishes, and they exhibit most pride in those who do. Instead of wearing down the foolish barrier of prejudice which separates Industrial Art from the "Fine Arts," they help to make it endure. As for the principal schools of the country they are out and out for "Fine Arts."

What is the fetich of "Fine Arts" when you look it fairly in the face? It is the distortion of a truism, that when two things are equally well done, that which deals with the nobler subject is the better of the two. Thus Benvenuto Cellini was more proud of his Perseus than his salt cellars. But, supposing the Perseus were vilely done and the salt cellars excellently, would his pride in the former, because of its size and subject, be justified? Yet that is the false conclusion reached; that all painting of pictures and modeling of sculpture is superior to any purely decorative work, whether flat or raised; that the man who designs and executes a silver flagon must be inferior to every puncher of clay, and he who designs a wall-covering necessarily in a lower grade than any painter of pictures. Stated thus boldly, the contention is obviously rubbish. Yet garnished with specious generalities, the fallacy is accepted for fact and influences the minds of more than half the artists and the curriculum of almost all the art schools. It has even distorted the meaning of the word "artist." The painter of pictures has all but monopolized it for himself; perhaps he allows it to a sculptor of figures, but grudgingly. To any one whose work is decorative, he denies it, dubbing him designer, with the mental reservation, not always reserved, that he is inferior to himself. It is insufferable arrogance and pernicious, because it perverts the minds of students, making them believe that to be an "artist," in this limited sense, is the only goal worth striving for.

Besides this prejudice there are, at least, two other causes which interfere with the efficiency of Industrial-Art education in this country. One is that the classes in decorative design are distinct from those which study the human figure and only a few, if any, students cover

FINE ARTS JURIES FOR PARIS

both courses; the other is the lack of opportunity to put the principles of design in practice by actually executing the design in any material. The true designer should have the figure at his finger ends equally with ornament; he has studied each in relation to the other, and can use them together. As it is, our designers are seldom masters of the figure and our painters have only a meagre knowledge of ornament. There are only a few of the latter who are fully qualified to undertake the decoration of an interior. Again, his ignorance of materials and methods of working them robs the designer of his right hand. He remains a theorist, when practical knowledge would enforce, inspire and give personal value to his work. Instead, it is dry and formal, without spontaneity or appropriateness.

The things to be desired are fuller recognition of the dignity of design, a broader system of training and the combination of artistic and technical instruction. Till we get them there will be much cry and little wool.



THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY BOARD AND FINE ARTS JURIES FOR THE PARIS EXHIBITION

MR. JOHN B. CAULDWELL, Director of Fine Arts in the United States Commission to the Paris Exposition, has issued another circular, containing information for intending exhibitors and announcing his appointments to the Advisory Board and National Juries.

The chief point of general interest, apart from the actual names, is the insistence upon one national jury for each division of exhibits. Pressure had been brought upon the director to authorise local juries to act for the artists of the various art centres. He has stood firm, however, and maintained his principle that we are going to make a national, not a sectional exhibit, and that uniformity and homogeneity could only be attained if the final decision rested with one body of men.

The National Advisory Board, which will be consulted regarding the general policy and administration of the Fine Arts Department,

and the several members of which will have a general supervision of local interests in their districts, consists of the following:

Thomas Allen, Boston, Mass.; John W. Beatty, director of the Carnegie Art Gallery, Pittsburgh, Pa.; D. H. Burnham, Chicago, Ill., director of works at the World's Fair; Howard Russell Butler, President of the American Fine Arts Society, New York; Thomas B. Clarke, New York; Walter Cook, New York; J. Templeman Coolidge, Jr., Boston, Mass.; J. H. Gest, assistant director of the Museum of Fine Arts, Cincinnati, O.; C. L. Hutchinson, President of the Art Institute, Chicago, Ill.; Halsey C. Ives, director of the Museum of Fine Arts, St. Louis, Mo.; Samuel A. Kauffmann, President of the Corcoran Art Gallery, Washington, D. C.; and Harrison S. Morris, managing director of the Academy of Fine Arts, Philadelphia, Pa.

Works of art, available as exhibits, are scheduled as follows: Group ii. Class 7—(A) Paintings in Oil, Water-Colors and Pastels; (B) Drawings and Illustrations; (C) Miniatures. Class 8. (D) Engravings and Etchings. Class 9. Sculpture and Engraving on medals and gems. Class 10. Architecture. For each of the subdivisions A, B, C, D and for each of the Classes 9 and 10 is a separate jury; six in all.

The Jury for Paintings, Water-Colors, and Pastels includes twenty-one members, as follows: Cecilia Beaux, Edwin H. Blashfield, J. G. Brown, William M. Chase, Ralph Clarkson, Frederick Dielman, Frank Duveneck, Winslow Homer, H. Bolton Jones, John LaFarge, George W. Maynard, H. Siddons Mowbray, Edward Simmons, T. C. Steele, Edmund C. Tarbell, D. W. Tryon, Frederic P. Vinton, R. W. Vonnoh, J. Alden Weir, Charles H. Woodbury, Edmund H. Wuerpel. This jury, commencing its sessions at the Fine Arts Building, New York, on November 10, will pass upon all works submitted in Class 7, Section A. Meanwhile to relieve artists residing in the Western States from the expense of sending their pictures to New York, a preliminary jury will meet in Chicago on October 20. It will be composed of the Western members of the National Jury and four Eastern men to be nominated from the same body, and its duty will be to sift over all the works sub-